

REMARKS

The present invention is a method of manufacturing multiple types of mobile electronic devices using a common engine assembly in each type and a mobile electronic device manufactured in accordance with a method of manufacturing mobile electronic devices of multiple types using a common engine assembly in each type. For example, in accordance with an embodiment of the invention, the engine assembly 330 including electronic components and software contained therein is provided for manufacturing of mobile electronic devices having, for example, a monoblock cover assembly 310 and a flip cover assembly 311. The monoblock cover assembly includes a fixed front cover 310 and a mating back cover 340 and the flip cover assembly includes a hinged flip cover 311 and a mating back cover 341. The manufacturing process utilizes the common engine assembly 330 within each of the monoblock cover assembly and the flip cover assembly. By utilization of the common engine assembly 330, manufacturing efficiencies are achieved. See page 6, paragraph 4, of the specification..

Claims 32-35, 33-40, 44, 46, 50-52, 56-58 and 60-62 stand rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 regarding the lack of antecedent basis for "the hinged flip type cover" assembly. Claims 32-34 and claims 50-52 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner and further amended to delete reference to "type" regarding the flip cover assembly. It appears that the Examiner has mistakenly identified claim 35 since the antecedent basis problem that is present in claims 32-34 and claims 50-52 prior to their amendment is not present in claim 35.

Claims 31, 35-37, 41, 42, 49 and 53-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102 as being anticipated by United States Patent 5,911,121 (Andrews). The Examiner reasons as follows:

Regarding claims 31 and 49, Andrews discloses a mobile electronic device (10) and a method of manufacturing mobile electronic devices comprising: providing common engine assemblies (Fig. 1) including electronic components (circuit board 46, etc.) and software contained therein (12, 14, etc.); providing monoblock cover assemblies each including a fixed front cover assembly (44 and Col. 3, lines 23-28) and a mating back cover (42) and flip type cover assemblies each including a front cover (44) having a hinged flip cover (Fig. 8) and a mating back cover (42); and disposing individual provided common engine assemblies including electronic components and software, within individual provided monoblock cover assemblies and disposing individual provided common engine assemblies within individual provided flip cover assemblies to respectively manufacture the mobile electronic devices having a monoblock cover assembly and a flip type cover assembly (Fig. 2).

These grounds of rejection are traversed for the following reasons.

Each of independent claims 31 and 49 recite in substance the manufacturing of multiple types of a mobile electronic device manufactured by a method of manufacturing mobile electronic devices having a monoblock cover assembly and mobile electronic devices having a flip cover assembly using a common engine assembly. This subject matter has no counterpart in Andrews.

Andrews teaches the manufacturing of different models of the same type of telephone using a common circuit board. See column 2, lines 8-18. Andrews discloses that interchangeable front covers are provided for each of the various models. See column 3, lines 23-40. These multiple covers are illustrated in Figs. 2, 6 and 8.

Andrews does not disclose the manufacturing of electronic devices having a monoblock cover assembly and mobile electronic devices having a flip cover assembly using a common engine assembly. In this regard the Examiner should note that Fig. 2 depicts the front cover 44 which includes a flip cover for protecting the keyboard 18 with the flip cover being positioned at a 90° angle with respect to the keypad. Furthermore, in Figs. 6 and 8 (the Examiner referred to Fig. 8 as showing a hinged cover) it should be noted that what is illustrated therein is the same type of flip cover phone as illustrated in Fig. 2. The differences between Figs. 6 and 8 are clearly taught as being phones with respectively a five function keypad and a six function keypad. As may be seen from Figs. 6 and 8, the flip cover is now pivoted at 180° so that it is in fact parallel to the face of the keypads. Moreover, it can be seen that the keypad of Fig. 2 with the cover pivoted at 90° appears to be identical to the six function keypad of Fig. 8.

Notably absent from the disclosure of Andrews is any suggestion that a common engine assembly may be used to manufacture mobile electronic devices having a monoblock cover assembly and mobile electronic devices having a flip cover assembly. It is submitted that all that Andrews discloses to a person of ordinary skill in the art is that a common engine assembly may be used to manufacture different models of mobile electronic devices of the same type having a flip cover assembly. There is not basis in the record why a person of ordinary skill in the art would be led to modify the teachings of Andrews to achieve the subject matter of claims 21 and 49 which pertains to

devices having monoblock and flip cover assemblies except by impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, it is submitted that dependent claims 35-37, 41, 42 and 53-55 are not anticipated by Andrews for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 31 and 49 and furthermore the dependent claims further limit the subject matter of independent claims 31 and 49 in a manner which is not anticipated by Andrews.

Claims 32-34, 38-40, 43-48, 50-52 and 56-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Andrews in view of the previously cited United States Patent 5,867,140 (Rader). These grounds of rejection are traversed for the following reasons.

Rader has been cited as teaching the step of mounting a detector switch on a hinged flip cover for detecting the open and closed positions of the cover. However, this teaching does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Andrews. Therefore, if a person of ordinary skill in the art were motivated to make the change suggested by the Examiner, the claimed subject matter would not be achieved.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the claims in the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the

filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (0173.40629X00) and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Donald E. Stout
Registration No. 26,422
(703) 312-6600

Attachments

DES:dlh